

Howard E. Cole
State Bar No. 4950
Jennifer K. Hostetler
State Bar No. 11994
LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE LLP
3993 Howard Hughes Pkwy., Suite 600
Las Vegas, NV 89169-5996
Tel: 702.949.8200
Fax: 702.949.8398
E-mail: hcole@lrrc.com
Email: jhostetler@lrrc.com

Kirstin E. Muller*
California State Bar No. 186373
Alison M. Hamer*
California State Bar No. 258281
Ferry E. Lopez*
California State Bar No. 274080
Benjamin J. Treger*
California State Bar No. 285283
HIRSCHFELD KRAEMER LLP
233 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 600
Santa Monica, CA 90401
Tel: 310.255.0705
Fax: 310.266.0986
E-mail: kmuller@hkemployment.com
E-mail: ahamer@hkemploymentlaw.com
E-mail: flopez@hkemploymentlaw.com
E-mail: btregger@hkemploymentlaw.com
*Has complied with LR IA 11-2

Attorneys for Defendants

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

DANIEL GONZALEZ and JEFFREY
HUGHES,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

DIAMOND RESORTS INTERNATIONAL
MARKETING, INC., DIAMOND RESORTS
INTERNATIONAL, INC., DIAMOND
RESORTS CORPORATION, and WEST MAUI
RESORTS PARTNERS, L.P.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:18-cv-00979-APG-NJK

**DEFENDANTS' UNOPPOSED MOTION
PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 7-3(C) TO
FILE A SECOND MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT THEREBY
EXCEEDING LOCAL RULE 7-3(A)'S
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PAGE LIMIT**

Pursuant to Local Rule LR 7-3(c), Defendants Diamond Resorts International Marketing, Inc. and West Maui Resorts Partners, L.P. (collectively “Defendants”) file this unopposed motion to file a second Motion for Summary Judgment on grounds separate from their first Motion for Summary Judgment (“First Motion”) and thereby exceed Local Rule LR 7-3(a)’s 30-page limit for motions for summary judgment. This motion is accompanied by the required declaration, attached hereto as Exhibit A. The factors set forth in the declaration, all of which are incorporated herein by reference, establish good cause to allow Defendants to exceed the collective 30-page motion for summary judgment page limit. Thus, Defendants request the Court grant this motion.

This is a complex class and collective action involving 620 Hawaii class members and 790 Opt-In Plaintiffs who assert wage and hour claims founded in state and federal law. On March 19, 2021, Defendants filed a Motion for Summary Judgment or in the alternative, Partial Summary Judgment addressing Defendants’ procedural defenses relating to the two named plaintiffs and certain Hawaii class members and Opt-In Plaintiffs. (ECF No. 202.) Specifically, Defendants’ First Motion addressed arguments that: (1) named plaintiff Daniel Gonzalez and numerous Opt-in Plaintiffs are barred from participating in this collective action due to their involvement as class members in a prior wage and hour class action settlement that released the federal wage and hour claim at issue in this action, (2) several Opt-in Plaintiffs and Hawaii Class Members are contractually barred from participating in this action by virtue of individual releases they entered into with Defendants, (3) numerous Opt-in Plaintiffs are barred from participating in this collective action because they were not employed by Defendants within the applicable statute of limitations, and (4) named plaintiff Jeffrey Hughes and multiple Hawaii Class Members and Opt-in Plaintiffs are barred from participating in this action due to judicial estoppel and/or a lack of standing because they filed for bankruptcy and did not report their alleged entitlement to overtime wages from Defendants and only the bankruptcy trustee has standing to pursue the claims at issue in this action. Because the foregoing defenses related to numerous parties in this action and Defendants needed to set forth material facts relating to the various individuals, as well

1 as the applicable law, and apply that law, the First Motion required Defendants to use the
2 maximum 30-page limit LR 7-3(a) sets forth for motions for summary judgment.

3 Defendants intend to file a second Motion for Summary Judgment relating to their wage
4 and hour exemption and good faith defenses – both of which are completely unrelated to the
5 defenses raised in their First Motion - on Monday April 26. As in the First Motion, Defendants
6 will require adequate pages to include a statement of material facts, the applicable law, and to set
7 forth their legal arguments. Defendants anticipate the second Motion for Summary Judgment will
8 be 23-pages long. Because of the complex nature of this class and collective action, as well as the
9 level of factual detail and analysis needed to support Defendants’ defenses, Defendants could not
10 have raised all of their defenses in a single motion confined to 30 pages.

11 Defendants value brevity and this Court’s time. Defendants’ need to exceed the page limit
12 is not due to unnecessarily verbose drafting; rather, it is required to allow Defendants the space
13 necessary to fully argue their defenses and explain why the Court should grant summary
14 judgment in Defendants’ favor. Allowing Defendants to file a second motion for summary
15 judgment and/or exceed the page limit set forth in LR 7-3(a) also serves the interests of efficiency
16 and judicial economy by avoiding litigation of these defenses at trial.

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 Based on the foregoing, good cause exists to permit two Motions for Summary Judgment,
2 which combined will exceed the 30-page limit set forth in LR 7-3(a). Defendants accordingly
3 request permission to file a second Motion for Summary Judgment, which combined with
4 Defendants' First Motion will exceed LR 7-3(a)'s 30-page limit by approximately 23 pages.

5
6
7
8 Dated: April 23, 2021

HIRSCHFELD KRAEMER LLP

9
10 /s/ ALISON M. HAMER
11 KIRSTIN E. MULLER
12 (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)
13 California Bar No. 186373
14 ALISON M. HAMER
15 (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)
16 California Bar No. 258281
17 FERRY E. LOPEZ
18 (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)
19 BENJAMIN J. TREGER
20 (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)
21 California Bar No. 285283
22 Hirschfeld Kraemer LLP
23 233 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 600
24 Santa Monica, CA 90401

25 HOWARD E. COLE
26 Nevada Bar No. 4950
27 JENNIVER K. HOSTETLER
28 Nevada Bar No. 11994
3993 Howard Hughes Pkwy, Suite 600
Las Vegas, NV 89169-5996

Attorneys for Defendants

23 IT IS SO ORDERED:

24 Dated: April 26, 2021

25 
26 ANDREW P. GORDON
27 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on April 23, 2021, I caused a true and accurate copy of the foregoing, **DEFENDANTS' UNOPPOSED MOTION PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 7-3(C) TO FILE A SECOND MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT THEREBY EXCEEDING LOCAL RULE 7-3(A)'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT PAGE LIMIT** to be filed with the Clerk of the Court via the Court's CM/ECF system, which sent an electronic copy of the same to the following counsel of record:

Michael N. Feder
DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC
3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 800
Las Vegas, NV 89169
Phone: (702) 550-4440
Fax: (844) 670-6009
Email: mfeder@dickinson-wright.com

Martin D. Holmes
Peter F. Klett
DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC
Fifth Third Center, Suite 800
424 Church Street
Nashville, TN 37219
Phone: (615) 244-6538
Fax: (844) 670-6009
Email: mdholmes@dickinsonwright.com
Email: pklett@dickinsonwright.com

Howard E. Cole
Jennifer K. Hostetler
LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE LLP
3993 Howard Hughes Pkwy., Ste. 600
Las Vegas, NV 89169-5996
Phone: (702) 949-8200
Fax: (702) 949-8398
Email: hcole@lrrc.com; jhostetler@lrrc.com

Trevor W. Howell
Howell Law, PLLC
P.O. Box 158511
Nashville, TN 37215
Phone: (615) 406-1416
Email: trevor@howelllawfirmllc.com

Dated this 23rd day of April, 2021.



Karen Torres